

1 THE HONORABLE RICHARD A. JONES

2
3
4
5
6
7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
8 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
9 AT SEATTLE

10 SUSAN CASSERD,

11 Plaintiff,

12 v.

13 NANCY A. BERRYHILL, in her capacity
as Acting Commissioner of the Social
Security Administration¹,

14 Defendant.

Case No. C14-00451-RAJ

ORDER

15
16 THIS MATTER comes before the Court on Plaintiff's Motion to Seal. Dkt. # 23.
17 Defendant did not respond to Plaintiff's Motion. Pursuant to Local Rule 5(g), the party
18 who designates a document confidential must provide a "specific statement of the
19 applicable legal standard and the reasons for keeping a document under seal, including
20 an explanation of: (i) the legitimate private or public interest that warrant the relief
21 sought; (ii) the injury that will result if the relief sought is not granted; and (iii) why a
22 less restrictive alternative to the relief sought is not sufficient." W.D. Wash. Local
23 Rules LCR 5(g). The party seeking to seal a judicial record must show that "compelling
24 reasons supported by specific factual findings . . . outweigh the general history of access
25

26 ¹ Nancy A. Berryhill is now the Acting Commissioner of the Social Security Administration.
27 Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 25(d), Nancy A. Berryhill is substituted for
Carolyn W. Colvin as defendant in this suit.

1 and the public policies favoring disclosure.” *Kamakana v. City of Honolulu*, 447 F.3d
2 1172, 1178-78 (9th Cir. 2006).

3 Plaintiff, filing her motion *pro se*, requests that the Court seal the judgment
4 entered in this case on December 17, 2014 (Dkt. # 17). Plaintiff also notes that the
5 document is widely available on the internet and can be accessed through the Google
6 search engine. Dkt. # 23. While Plaintiff provides compelling reasons for wanting to
7 keep the information at issue sealed, Plaintiff does not provide a specific statement of
8 the applicable legal standard or reasons why a less restrictive alternative to the relief
9 sought is not sufficient. Plaintiff also fails to articulate an injury that would result if the
10 Court does not grant her Motion. Plaintiff filed this Motion two years after the
11 judgment was issued, it was disseminated during that time period, and has been
12 available to the public for quite some time. Having considered the relevant documents
13 and legal standard, the Court **DENIES** Plaintiff’s motion. Dkt. # 23.

14 SO ORDERED this 6th day of December, 2018.

15
16
17 

18 The Honorable Richard A. Jones
19 United States District Judge
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27